

Application No. 09/739,392
Amendment dated: September 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 2, 2005

Page 5 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and new claims 15 to 20 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found, for example, on pages 9, 10 and 14 of the application.

Regarding the objection to the disclosure, it should be clarified that the "www.tellme.com" reference is not part of the invention, but is used to indicate the address (and nothing more) of a known prior art system. The passage reads:

" One particular prior art system exists that attempts to address some of these drawbacks. On Apr. 10, 2000, in a company press release, Tellme Networks Inc. of Mountainview, Calif. announced a telephone-accessed service named Tellme.TM. which, at that time, was accessible via a toll-free number and customizable either by telephone or on the www.tellme.com web site."

It should be clear that the "www.tellme.com" reference simply tells the reader that the system was customizable at the particular web site. However, it is not necessary for the reader to be able to access the web site to understand the invention or the problem solved. Accordingly, the "www.tellme.com" reference is already non-executable text, and, therefore there is no need to convert it to non-executable text.

Regarding section 6 of the official action, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that it is the user defined functions (and the profile which contains them) which is customized. Braman clearly does not teach, or even suggest, a system wherein the functions which are available to the user are user defined and customizable.

The cited passages in Braman only teach a system wherein directory numbers/names can be entered by a user via a VAS. For example, the cited passage at page 5, line 1 of Braman reads: "In the event that the caller is programming a new directory entry, VAS will first train or capture the directory name selected by the caller and determine the corresponding phone number."

However programming a new directory entry does not teach or suggest customizing the user defined functions within a selected profile of user-defined functions. Braman merely teaches a

Application No. 09/739,392
Amendment dated: September 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 2, 2005

Page 6 of 8

system of the type discussed as prior art in the present application (e.g., see page 4 or page 8 of the present application), and suffers from the same deficiencies.

For example, quoting from page 8, lines 5 to 16 of the present application:

"In prior art systems, such as the Tellme system described above, this summary was restricted to providing information relating to system-defined functions. Although the user had the ability to select particular desired functions from the list of available functions, the user was not permitted to customize the functions themselves. In contrast, the present invention permits a user to define the functions that are used. Therefore, the user has complete control over the potential contents of these user-defined functions as opposed to the restrictions inherent in the prior art system-defined functions."

The invention of claim 1 permits a user to customize the functions themselves. This feature is simply not taught or even suggested by the Braman reference. Accordingly, Braman does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed subject matter.

Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 (and consequently its dependent claims) is solicited. Similar arguments apply to the dependent claims, which each add further limitations which further distinguish over the Braman reference.

For example, regarding paragraph 8 of the original OA which rejects claim 3, the rejection is traversed as follows. First, as a dependent claim, it is patentable for the reasons outlined above. Furthermore, the cited passage of Braman (namely pg 5 lines 27 to page 6) teaches a system which prompts a user for commands (which are predefined, and not user defined). One of the commands is Program. When Programming, Braman teaches entering a name/number, and then recording a string of actions (i.e., DTMF sequences) for accessing a voice mail system associated with the name/number. However, this is simply not relevant to the subject matter of claim 3, which claims:

Application No. 09/739,392
Amendment dated: September 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 2, 2005

Page 7 of 8

"3. A method according to claim 1 wherein said **step of customizing** comprises **specifying** a command menu structure in a dual tone multi frequency driven user interface." (emphasis added).

The cited passage in Braman merely teaches the ability to select a command (of Program) and then capture a series of DTMF inputs. Braman simply does not teach customizing the user-defined functions for use within a profile of user-defined functions, let alone **specifying** a command menu structure for said user-defined functions. Accordingly, the subject matter of claim 3 is simply not taught or suggested by the cited passage of Braman, or by Braman generally.

Similar arguments apply to the remaining claims which depend from claim 1.

The rejection to claim 6 in paragraph 11 of the official action, is similarly traversed. For ease of reference, claim 6 is set out:

6. A method of providing a customized speech based user interface to an application system, said application system comprising a speech user interface subsystem, a profile database, and application components, the method comprising the steps of:

- receiving an access request from a user;
- retrieving a customized profile for the user from said database, said customized profile comprising user-defined functions;
- presenting said user-defined functions via said customized speech based user interface in accordance with said customized profile; and
- providing access to data elements presented in said user-defined functions.

Once again, the cited passages in Braman only teach a system wherein directory numbers/names can be entered by a user via a VAS. For example, the cited passage at page 5, line 1 of Braman reads: "In the event that the caller is programming a new directory entry, VAS will first train or capture the directory name selected by the caller and determine the corresponding phone number."

Application No. 09/739,392
Amendment dated: September 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 2, 2005

Page 8 of 8

This, and the other cited passages, simply does not teach the claimed subject matter. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, retrieving a customized profile of user-defined functions and presenting said user-defined functions as required by the claim is simply not taught or suggested by the Braman reference.

Regarding the rejection to claim 11, claim 11 has been amended to clarify the customization means permits customization of user defined functions (emphasis added). Accordingly, this claim is patentable over the Braman reference for the reasons set out above.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit \$790.00 from Deposit Account No. 501593, representing the government fees for filing a Request for Continued Examination, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, and credit any over payments to Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Brennan et. al.

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9
CANADA
Tel: (613) 237-5160
Fax: (613) 787-3558
E-mail: jmeasures@blgcanada.com
IP-OTT-118125401

By:


Jeffrey Measures
Registration No. 40,272